



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,774	12/07/2000	A. Kent Porterfield	M4065.0405/P405	9138

24998 7590 07/31/2003

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

DANG, KHANH NMN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/730,774	Applicant(s) PORTERFIELD, A. KENT	
	Examiner Khanh Dang	Art Unit 2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-35, 37-46, 48-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blackmon et al.

At the outset, it is noted that similar claims will be grouped together to avoid repetition in explanation. As broadly drafted, these claims do not define any structure that differs from Blackmon et al.

With regard to claim 37, 38, 42-46, 48, 50-59, and 62-64, Blackmon et al. discloses a processor system comprising: a processor (72, 74, 78); a link hub (42) connected to the processor (72, 74, 78) via a processor bus (104, 106, 108, 110, 116, 118); a satellite device (76, 80, 82); and a link bus (112, 114, 120, 122, 124, 126) connected between the link hub (42) and the satellite device (76, 80, 82), the link bus

Art Unit: 2181

✓ (42) comprising a status line and a first bus, one of said link hub (42) and said satellite device (76, 80, 83) being a bus master and the other of said link hub (42) and satellite device (76, 80, 83) being a target, wherein said master issues a data transfer request on said first bus, obtains a status of the request by observing said status line during a first predetermined window of time, determines from the obtained request status whether a data transfer corresponding to the request should be initiated, and initiates the data transfer over said first bus when the data transfer should be initiated.

Specifically, in Blackmon et al., upon receiving a command or request, each bus device responds by issuing an address status response signal to a response combining logic module or Link Hub (42). The response combining logic module (42) identifies which bus device (if any) responded to the command or request with a positive acknowledge. The response combining logic module then sends a bus device identifier to the switch via a destination route bus identifying which bus device responded with the positive acknowledge. The switch uses the device identifier returned via the response combining logic to route any subsequent data transfers associated with the issued command or request. FIG. 1 shows a plurality of bus devices 32A, 32B, 32C and 32D, hereinafter referred to collectively as 32, connected to a centralized switch 34 via a plurality of point-to-point connections 36A, 36B, 36C and 36D, hereinafter referred to collectively as 36. Bus devices 32 include, but are not limited to: processors, I/O hubs, and memory controllers. The plurality of point-to-point connections 36 collectively form a system bus for the switch based topology. A response combining logic module or Link Hub 42 is coupled to each bus device 32 via address status response signals 37A, 37B, 37C and

37D, hereinafter referred to collectively as 37. Address status response signals 37 carry a signal response generated by each of the bus devices 32 in response to an issued command or request on the system bus. See also Table 1 and description thereof. Also shown in Fig. 1, for each address bus 38 operation there are three major points where information can be passed. The address command is always the first point, where a bus master drives address bus 38. The second point where information is passed in the address status mechanism occurs when bus devices 32 provide low latency feedback (two-bit address status output (AStatOut) signal and a two-bit address status input (AStatIn) signal) in response to the issued command or request. The AStatOut/AStatIn status response signals 37 provide a positive acknowledge of an address being accepted by a bus device, a null response (stall), or an indication that the transaction should be terminated immediately (i.e., address parity error or retry). A slave drives the AStatOut signal(s) active starting on the second cycle after it samples an address, and holds the AStatOut signal(s) active for two clock cycles (or a so-called "a first predetermined window of time." The address status AStatIn is typically sampled 2 bus clock cycles later. Alternatively, the signals may be latched and re-driven after one additional bus clock cycle. AStatOut and AStatIn are then driven anew if a new address cycle is begun, or inactivated. AStatOut and AStatIn are always driven. In another word, data transfer can always be retried (if "stall" occurs) in every or a predetermined number of predetermined clock cycle(s), namely first, second, third "predetermined window of time." With regard to claim 38, in Blackmon et al., the bus identifier identifies which of the plurality of bus devices returned the positive

Art Unit: 2181

acknowledge to the issued command; and routing a data packet associated with the issued command to the bus device returning the positive acknowledge response to the issued command (see claim 8 of Blackmon et al.). With regard to claims 39-41, 60, and 61, in Blackmon et al., when a requestor issues a request, a bus master drives the address portion with an address, an operation type identifier which defines a particular operation using the address bus, and the size of any data transferred as a result of the transaction. The address also includes an 8-bit address tag which is used to identify the operation to a particular master and command instance. With regard to claim 49, it is clear from the data transfer protocol disclosed by Blackmon et al. and also, from the discussion above that the transfer should be stopped when such transfer is on a boundary of data. With regard to claims 1-35, one using the device of Blackmon et al. would have performed the same steps set forth in claims 1-35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 36 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackmon et al.

Blackmon et al. discloses the claimed invention except the use of a pull-up resistor for driving the request or command status onto the request line. However, such pull-up resistor is old and well-known as evidenced from Kim et al. and Edwards et al., both cited below as supportive evidences. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Blackmon et al. with a pull-up resistor for driving the request or command status onto the request line of Blackmon et al., since the Examiner takes Official Notice that such pull-up resistor is old and well-known for its use to drive the request status to a request line as clearly evidenced from at least Kim et al. and Edwards et al.

Claims 65, 66, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackmon et al.

Blackmon et al. discloses the claimed invention including the use of address bus 38 having 64 bits wide for supporting addressing of multiple address spaces. For example, the multiple address spaces may include a multiple microchannel I/O space of 32 bits, a real memory space of 48 bits maximum, and a special purpose address space to pass interrupts and processor commands between bus devices 32. Address bus 38 includes an address tag used to identify the current operation to a particular Master and command instance. This tag is matched with a corresponding tag on data bus 40 at switch 34 to associate any data that corresponds to this address command. Blackmon et al. does not disclose the use of a time multiplexor, as an alternative way for either initiating, disconnecting, retry, aborting and stalling data

Art Unit: 2181

transfer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Blackmon et al. with such a time multiplexing device, as an alternative way, to either initiate, disconnect, retry, abort and stall data transfer, since the Examiner takes Official Notice that such time multiplexing device is old and well known and using one to implement a function of logically initiating, disconnecting, retry, abort and stall, for example, is clearly within level of one having ordinary skill in the art. If Applicants choose to challenge the fact that such time multiplexer is old and well-known for the purpose discussed above, supportive evidences will be provided upon request.

Claims 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackmon et al.

The further difference between Blackmon et al. and the claimed subject matter is the use of a pull-up resistor for driving the request or command status onto the request line. However, such pull-up resistor is old and well-known as evidenced from Kim et al. and Edwards et al., both cited below as supportive evidences. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Blackmon et al. with a pull-up resistor for driving the request or command status onto the request line of Blackmon et al., since the Examiner takes Official Notice that such pull-up resistor is old and well-known for its use to drive the request status to a request line as clearly evidenced from at least Kim et al. and Edwards et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/10/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At the outset, Applicants are reminded that claims subject to examination will be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. *In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 1571, 222 USPQ 934, 936 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Applicants are also reminded that claimed subject matter not the specification, is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification can not be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. *In re Sporck*, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F.2d, 155 USPQ 687 (1986).

With this in mind, the discussion will focus on how the terms and relationships thereof in the claims are met by the references. Response to any limitations that are not in the claims or any arguments that are irrelevant and/or do not relate to any specific claimed language will not be warranted.

With regard to claim 1 (with claims 36, 47, 65, 66, and 68 stand or fall together), Applicants argued that Blackmon et al. does not disclose "obtaining a status of [an] initiated transfer by observing the status line during a second predetermined window of time; and determining from the obtain transfer status whether the initiated data transfer should be stalled." Contrary to Applicants' argument, in Blackmon et al., the AStatOut/AStatIn status response signals 37 provide a positive acknowledge of an address being accepted by a bus device, a null response (stall), or an indication that the

transaction should be terminated immediately (i.e., address parity error or retry). A slave drives the AStatOut signal(s) active starting on the second cycle after it samples an address, and holds the AStatOut signal(s) active for two clock cycles (or a so-called "a first predetermined window of time." The address status AStatIn is typically sampled 2 bus clock cycles later. Alternatively, the signals may be latched and re-driven after one additional bus clock cycle. AStatOut and AStatIn are then driven anew if a new address cycle is begun, or inactivated. AStatOut and AStatIn are always driven. In another word, data transfer can always be retried (if "stall" occurs) in every or a predetermined number of predetermined clock cycle(s), namely first, second, third "predetermined window of time."

Applicants also argued that the "Office Action is silent with respect to claims 67 and 69." The Examiner disagrees. It should have been clear to Applicants that there were only typing errors resulting in the fact that claims 67 and 69 were not specifically discussed in the previous Office Action. The subject matter of claim 67 was fully addressed and discussed in the body of the 103 rejection on page 8 of the Office Action. The subject matter of claim 69 was already covered by claim 51, for example; and the subject matter of claim 51 was fully addressed and discussed in the 103 rejection on page 3 of the Office Action. Corrections to these typing errors, mentioned above, have already been made.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Khanh Dang at telephone number 703-308-0211.



Khanh Dang
Primary Examiner